

# Quantum Gravity and String Theory



## Physical Review Letters Correspondence with Associate Editor

**Authors:** [Nigel B. Cook](#), [Stanley G. Brown](#)

Emails of more detailed discussion with the associate editor of Physical Review Letters on 22 January 2003 over the mechanism of gravity (see <http://vixra.org/abs/1305.0012> for brief summary or <http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111> and related uploads to vixra for more detail). Once specious and otherwise false claims by Physical Review Letters are omitted, we are left with an email from the associate editor Richard Price which arrogantly and ignorantly declares: "You are proposing a very nonstandard mechanism for gravity ... Your mechanism/model is highly nonstandard and, as such, needs very thorough justification. Physical Review Letters is not the appropriate journal for such a presentation." This last sentence basically terminates any possibility of publishing the facts in the PRL, regardless of the thoroughness of the presentation, because they state that the journal is not the place for a scientific revolution based on proved facts.

**Comments:** 3 Pages.

**Download:** [PDF](#)

### Submission history

[[v1](#)] 2015-11-03 16:41:11

**Unique-IP document downloads:** 16 times

**Add your own feedback and questions here:**

*You are equally welcome to be positive or negative about any paper but please be polite. If you are being critical you must mention at least one specific error, otherwise your comment will be deleted as unhelpful.*

Recommend Share

Sort by Best ▾



Join the discussion...



**Nige Cook** · 2 minutes ago



Just to add some humour, imagine PRL's editor's enthusiastic response to non-PhD innovator Isaac N:

"Dr Isaac N.

"We regret to inform you that your paper suggesting an inverse law of gravity, while claiming to be based on facts and confirmed by experimental data, is inappropriate for publication in mainstream peer-reviewed journals. It is merely an alternative to the widely loved STANDARD theory of Aristotle, which correctly predicts that all feathers, bits of paper and a host of other light objects fall at a linear, non-accelerating rate. Yes, I know you argue that cannon balls disagree with this, and that the discrepancy can be explained away by your personal pet theory that air drag resistance is proportional to the square of velocity, but this is a highly NON-STANDARD theory, contradicting the laws well established for about 2000 years by generations of leading physicists. Adding an extra layer of complexity by replacing Aristotle's single linear velocity gravity law by an accelerating law in addition to a law of air drag resistance is needlessly complicated, thus contravening "Occam's Razor" principle that theories should not be needlessly multiplied. Anyhow, you have not proved by actual experiment that an apple will actually fall at a rate which is in accord with your equations on the moon, or anywhere else. Unless you prove by actual experiment that your pet theory is applicable to all circumstances, on every planet and moon in the universe, it is mere hypothesis. We'll keep on using Aristotle's dogma because our logo is MOVING PHYSICS FORWARD: "Full papers only available on subscription. However, abstracts of papers accessible by everybody." Even if you do revise your paper with further research and further tests and experimental confirmations, this is not the place to publish in. Think how conservative peer reviewed journals are! If we were seen engaging with revolutionary ideas, the democrats in the God fearing US Government would cut off funding for all the researchers who have PhD's in Aristotle's spin-2 graviton dogma! Then nobody would subscribe and we'd be unemployed. Bye bye science."

^ | ▾ · Edit · Reply · Share ›



**Nige Cook** · a day ago

Other information and video presentations are available totally free of charge at the website <http://quantumfieldtheory.org/>

^ | ▾ · Edit · Reply · Share ›



**Nige Cook** · a day ago

Please note that Stanley Brown's first response on 2 January 2003 was to claim that there was a fault in the presentation, see <http://vixra.org/abs/1511.0036> but as soon as I requested an objective assessment of precisely where his alleged fault was, and also offered to rewrite the paper to any presentation style he wanted, he then changed the goalposts and gets Richard Price to send a response in this email of 22 January 2003 stating that ANY presentation on the subject will automatically be rejected: "Your mechanism/model is highly nonstandard and, as such, needs very thorough justification. Physical Review Letters is not the appropriate journal for such a presentation." This is the kind of pseudoscientific subjective, anti-objective, attitude problem that causes stagnation in science. I still get some ignorant folk in journalism (TV, newspapers and magazines) ignorantly claiming that "peer" reviewed journals like PRL are the place to publish and get feedback for new, predictive methods in QFT. It's weird, because - again without reading or checking my paper - they will automatically side with the non-objective censorship of PRL as if the editor is the leader of a religious dogma to be worshipped regardless of what it says. The whole idea of journalism at least taking the underdog seriously in a struggle just to have the facts critically and seriously examined, is a joke. There is no serious interest, quite the opposite. There is strong hostility against innovation, dressed up in propaganda which claims the exact opposite. Similar attitude problems existed in dictatorial regimes where criticisms of eugenics were suppressed in a similar way. If anyone wants to read the SCIENTIFIC facts, please see: <http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111> <http://vixra.org/abs/1301.0187>

[Contact](#) - [Disclaimer](#) - [Privacy](#) - [Funding](#)